

1           **Healthcare workers’ compliance with COVID-19**  
2           **preventive and control measures at De Martino**  
3           **Hospital, Mogadishu, Somalia**

4

5

6   Abdullahi Ibrahim Janay<sup>1¶</sup> \*, Bulent Kilic<sup>1</sup>, Belgin Unal<sup>1¶</sup>

7

8

9

10   <sup>1</sup> Department of Public Health, Institute of Health Sciences, Dokuz Eylul University,  
11   Izmir, Turkey

12

13

14   \* Corresponding author

15   E-mail: [Abdullahijanaay5@gmail.com](mailto:Abdullahijanaay5@gmail.com) (A.I.J)

16

17

18   Short title: Healthcare workers’ compliance with COVID-19 preventive and control  
19   measures

20

21

22   ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work

23

24   NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

## 25 **Abstract**

### 26 **Background and objectives**

27 Healthcare workers are a high-risk group for COVID-19 and protecting them is  
28 crucial for healthcare delivery. Limited studies have explored compliance with  
29 infection prevention and control (IPC) practices among Somali healthcare workers.  
30 This study aimed to determine compliance with IPC practices among healthcare  
31 workers in De Martino Public Hospital, Somalia.

### 32 **Materials and methods**

33 A cross-sectional study was conducted at De Martino Public Hospital, Mogadishu,  
34 Somalia from August to October 2022, with the participation of 204 healthcare  
35 workers (response rate = %97). Compliance was assessed using responses to 25  
36 questions on a five-point Likert-type scale, and the median score of 20 was used to  
37 dichotomize compliance scores. A chi-square test and logistic regression analysis  
38 were performed to check the associations between healthcare workers'  
39 sociodemographic information, related factors to IPC, work conditions and practices  
40 on COVID-19, and IPC compliance during healthcare interventions using SPSS 23  
41 version.

### 42 **Results**

43 In total, 58.3% of the participants had good compliance with IPC. There were  
44 significant associations between IPC compliance and the type of healthcare worker  
45 (doctors and doctor assistants: 72.3%, nurses and paramedical staff: 67.3%, non-  
46 clinical staff: 5.7%,  $p < 0.01$ ). After adjusting for potential confounding factors,  
47 compared to non-clinical staff, doctors and doctor assistants (OR: 12.11, 95% CI: 2.23

48 -65.84) nurses and paramedical staff (OR: 21.38, 95% CI: 4.23 - 108.01) had higher  
49 compliance with infection prevention and control measures. There were no significant  
50 associations between compliance and gender, marital status, vaccination status, or  
51 smoking ( $p>0.05$  for all).

## 52 **Conclusions**

53 Inadequate compliance with COVID-19 IPC measures was observed among hospital  
54 workers. Prioritizing awareness campaigns and behavior change interventions,  
55 especially among non-clinical staff, is crucial for effective COVID-19 infection  
56 prevention and control within the hospital.

57

## 58 **Introduction**

59 The COVID-19 pandemic was the most recent and the worst pandemic in the 21st  
60 century, and has resulted in 765 million confirmed cases and 6.9 million deaths  
61 worldwide as of May 3, 2023 [1].

62 This highly infectious virus can be transmitted by asymptomatic carriers and those in  
63 the incubation period, making isolation until testing negative crucial [2]. Quarantine  
64 measures are essential for persons from endemic areas or with confirmed contact and  
65 for mild cases not requiring medical attention [3]. All age groups are susceptible to  
66 the virus, but elderly persons with underlying health conditions are at higher risk of  
67 severe illness [4]. Healthcare workers (HCWs) are also vulnerable, emphasizing the  
68 importance of infection prevention and control (IPC) practices and personal protective  
69 equipment (PPE) use [5].

70 IPC strategies include non-pharmaceutical interventions like school and workplace  
71 closures, event bans, stay-at-home orders, and movement restrictions, which have  
72 reduced transmission [6]. Personal protective measures are also an important  
73 component of COVID-19 infection prevention and control [7]. Vaccines have been  
74 developed, but their effectiveness varies by variant, with better protection against  
75 severe outcomes. Vaccine effectiveness against symptomatic disease was higher for  
76 the delta variant than for the omicron variant. With previous variants, vaccine  
77 effectiveness against severe disease, including hospitalization and death, has been  
78 higher and retained for longer than effectiveness against mild disease [8].

79 World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 is an emergency public  
80 health problem of international concern that poses a high risk to countries with  
81 vulnerable health systems on January 30, 2020 [9]. Despite the Director General of  
82 the WHO declared the end of COVID-19 as a public health emergency and is no  
83 longer a global threat on May 5th 2023, he said that COVID-19 is still killing and  
84 warned of the risks from the new emerging variants [10]. In fragile settings like  
85 Somalia where the number of HCWs is significantly lower than required for  
86 Sustainable Development Goals, the protection of health workers is vital [11]. To  
87 protect HCWs, Enough supplies of PPE should be ensured and HCWs should be  
88 trained in using it. The environmental hygiene of hospitals and the personal hygiene  
89 of HCWs should be maintained [2]. HCWs should maintain contact reduction to  
90 reduce the number of infections [7].

91 It was reported from China that the potential risk of COVID-19 has largely improved  
92 the IPC behaviors of HCWs working in hospitals [12]. Determination of compliance  
93 of the hospital workers with the COVID-19 IPC practices and the factors affecting

94 this compliance is important for the protection of hospital workers during the  
95 pandemic. Studies assessing COVID-19 IPC practices in Somali hospitals and HCWs  
96 are limited. This cross-sectional study assessed the COVID-19 IPC compliance  
97 among HCWs in De Martino Public Hospital during healthcare interventions and  
98 determined the factors affecting their compliance to improve hospital workers'  
99 compliance with COVID-19 IPC practices.

100

## 101 **Materials and methods**

102 This hospital-based cross-sectional study was performed at De Martino Public  
103 Hospital in Mogadishu, Somalia's capital. It was built during Italy's colonial era and  
104 is currently under the management of the Ministry of Health and Human Services of  
105 the Federal Government of Somalia. It provides free medical care, especially for  
106 inpatients. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the hospital exclusively served COVID-  
107 19 patients. The hospital has 115 beds and offers a range of services, including  
108 polyclinics, inpatient care, emergency services, and intensive care.

109 In 2019, there were a total of 61 health facilities run by public in the Benadir region,  
110 which encompasses the capital city [13]. De Martino hospital in this region serves as a  
111 secondary referral hospital (RH) indicating its role in providing specialized care. It's  
112 important to note that while RHs like De Martino Hospital offer valuable specialist  
113 services, they may face challenges in meeting the extensive demand due to limited  
114 capacity and resources [14]. During the COVID-19 pandemic, De Martino Hospital  
115 emerged as a key center for managing COVID-19 cases, playing a vital role in the  
116 national response. This underscores its importance in addressing public health  
117 challenges, even during unprecedented events like a global pandemic.

## 118 **The study population and sample size**

119 The study population is 210 HCWs working at De Martino Hospital between 5  
120 August and 5 November 2022. HCWs include all hospital staff who provide health  
121 services directly or indirectly, such as managers, secretaries, doctors, nurses,  
122 laboratory technicians, radiologists, pharmacists, cleaners, security, or other  
123 personnel. All HCWs working in the hospital were aimed to be included in the study.  
124 In total, 204 HCWs were reached during data collection in the study and their  
125 informed consent was obtained using a written form.

## 126 **The study variables**

127 To assess the HCWs' compliance with COVID-19 prevention and control practices  
128 (IPC), the use of personal practices during their healthcare interactions in the hospital  
129 was measured using a self-reported questionnaire. Accordingly, the questionnaire  
130 form was created under three main headings; Personal Protective Equipment (PPE),  
131 Hand washing and Hygiene (HH) and other COVID-19 IPC practices. The data on  
132 personal characteristics, related factors to IPC, work conditions and practices on  
133 COVID-19 were also included in the questionnaire form. The questionnaire was  
134 adapted from the WHO's risk assessment tool for healthcare workers in the context of  
135 COVID-19 [15], with some modifications according to the suitability of the hospital  
136 facility and using literature guidelines. The questionnaire is attached as "S1 File".

137 The anonymity and confidentiality of the participants were ensured; a specific number  
138 was given to every questionnaire, there were no any information that could identify  
139 individual participants during or after data collection. A pilot study was conducted  
140 initially, then the questionnaire was distributed to the hospital staff and the data was  
141 collected between 5 August and 5 November 2022. There were 25 questions

142 measuring the compliance of HCWs with COVID-19; for PPE 12 questions, for HH 7  
143 questions and for other COVID-19 IPC 6 questions IPC on the questionnaire.  
144 Responses to each question were measured using a 5-point Likert; "always (5 points),  
145 often (4 points), sometimes (3 points), rarely (2 points), or never (1 point)". The  
146 scores of each person's responses were categorized into two categories and the  
147 answers "always" and "most of the time" were taken as compliance. Then, the  
148 compliance responses of each participant were summed and the median was taken  
149 into account as the cut-off point; scores above the median were considered "high  
150 compliance".

## 151 **Data analysis**

152 For descriptive analyses, the variables measured by scale values were converted into  
153 categorical ones, and all independent variables were presented as percentages. In  
154 order to determine the association between independent variables and high  
155 compliance with the COVID-19 IPC measures, the Chi-square test was used by  
156 converting the scores of compliance to the COVID-19 IPC measures into two  
157 categories, and the answers "always" and "most of the time" were taken as  
158 "compliance". Then, the compliance responses of each participant were collected and  
159 the median was considered as the cut-off point. Scores above the median were  
160 considered "high compliance" and presented by percentage for descriptive analysis.

161 In order to identify the key independent factors associated with a high level of  
162 compliance with COVID-19 IPC measures, variables that showed significant  
163 associations with high compliance in univariate analyses were included in logistic  
164 regression models. The backward LR method was used to identify predictive variables

165 associated with the compliance of IPC measures and the association was presented  
166 with Odds ratio and 95% confidence interval.

167 Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 23) program was used in data analysis.

168 P values lower than 0.05 were considered significant.

## 169 **Ethics approval**

170 The study received ethical approval from Dokuz Eylul University's Non-  
171 Interventional Research Ethics Committee (approval date: 17.08.2022, decision  
172 number: 2022/26-08) and adhered to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and  
173 local institutional guidelines. Official permission was granted by De Martino Public  
174 Hospital in Mogadishu, Somalia. Research participants were informed about the  
175 study's purpose and methodology, and their consent was obtained during the data  
176 collection process.

177

## 178 **Results**

179 In total, data from 204 HCWs were analyzed, achieving a response rate of 97%.  
180 Among the participants, 51% were male (Table 1, column 4). The majority of HCWs  
181 (46.1%) fell in the 20 to 29 age group, while only 15.7% were aged 40 and above  
182 (Table 1, column 5). Approximately, 77.8% held bachelor's degrees or higher  
183 qualifications (Table 1, column 6). Nurses and paramedical staff constituted the  
184 largest group (51%), followed by (31.9%) doctors and doctor assistants (Table 2,  
185 column 4). Outpatient workers accounted for 20.1% of the participants, while  
186 inpatient workers made up 26.5%. HCWs in other clinical departments comprised  
187 29.9% of the total (Table 2, column 5).



## 188 **Compliance of COVID-19 IPC practices among healthcare** 189 **workers**

190 The total IPC compliance was 58.3% among the participants. HCWs demonstrated  
191 55.9% compliance with PPE during healthcare interactions, 55.4% for hand hygiene  
192 (HH), and 52% for other COVID-19 IPC measures during healthcare interactions (Fig  
193 1).

194 **Fig 1. COVID-19 IPC compliance in the HCWs (Total IPC, PPE Use, HH, other**  
195 **IPC), %**

196 **Note:** IPC: Infection Prevention and Control, PPE: Personal Protective Equipment,  
197 HH: Hand Hygiene.

198

199 Age and educational status were significantly associated with overall COVID-19 IPC  
200 and HH compliance ( $P < 0.05$  for all). Educational status was associated with  
201 compliance with PPE ( $p < 0.01$ ) and other COVID-19 IPC measures ( $p = 0.03$ ). Younger  
202 age groups and higher education level groups expressed better compliance (Table 1).

203 There was no association between any of the IPC, PPE, HH compliance and marital  
204 status, having a child at home, having an old/chronic disease patient at home, or  
205 having COVID-19 vaccination. There was no significant association between the IPC  
206 measure dimensions and work experience years (Table 1). Participants who received  
207 training on COVID-19 reported higher compliance with total IPC and PPE than those  
208 who did not receive training ( $p < 0.05$ ).

209

210 **Table 1. COVID-19 IPC compliance in HCWs during healthcare provision by**  
 211 **sociodemographic characteristics and related factors to IPC**

| Independent variables               | n   | %    | COVID-19 IPC compliance |       |          |       |      |       |            |      |
|-------------------------------------|-----|------|-------------------------|-------|----------|-------|------|-------|------------|------|
|                                     |     |      | Total IPC%              |       | PPE use% |       | HH%  |       | Other IPC% |      |
|                                     |     |      | High                    | p*    | High     | p*    | High | p*    | High       | p*   |
| <b>Sex</b>                          |     |      |                         |       |          |       |      |       |            |      |
| Male                                | 105 | 51.7 | 60                      | 0.58  | 61       | 0.15  | 55.2 | 0.98  | 52.4       | 0.85 |
| Female                              | 98  | 48.3 | 56.1                    |       | 51       |       | 55.1 |       | 51.0       |      |
| <b>Age group</b>                    |     |      |                         | 0.03  |          | 0.07  |      | 0.02  |            | 0.26 |
| 20 – 29                             | 94  | 46.1 | 62.6                    |       | 59.6     |       | 62.8 |       | 57.4       |      |
| 30 – 39                             | 78  | 38.2 | 61.5                    |       | 59       |       | 55.1 |       | 44.9       |      |
| 40 and above                        | 32  | 15.7 | 37.5                    |       | 37.5     |       | 34.4 |       | 53.1       |      |
| <b>Education level</b>              |     |      |                         | <0.01 |          | <0.01 |      | <0.01 |            | 0.03 |
| -Secondary degree and below         | 23  | 11.3 | 8.7                     |       | 13       |       | 8.7  |       | 26.1       |      |
| -Associate degree                   | 22  | 10.8 | 54.5                    |       | 50       |       | 45.5 |       | 54.5       |      |
| -Undergraduate and graduate degrees | 158 | 77.8 | 66.5                    |       | 63.3     |       | 63.9 |       | 55.7       |      |
| <b>Experience years</b>             |     |      |                         | 0.50  |          | 0.52  |      | 0.53  |            | 0.43 |
| 1 – 5                               | 118 | 59.9 | 58.5                    |       | 57.6     |       | 58.5 |       | 55.9       |      |
| 6 – 10                              | 59  | 29.9 | 64.4                    |       | 59.3     |       | 57.6 |       | 45.8       |      |
| 11 and above                        | 20  | 10.2 | 50                      |       | 45       |       | 45   |       | 50         |      |
| <b>Marital status</b>               |     |      |                         | 0.96  |          | 0.66  |      | 0.91  |            | 0.12 |
| Married                             | 102 | 50.5 | 57.8                    |       | 55.1     |       | 53.9 |       | 50         |      |
| Unmarried                           | 16  | 7.9  | 56.3                    |       | 50       |       | 64.3 |       | 31.3       |      |
| Divorced/Widow                      | 84  | 41.6 | 59.5                    |       | 59.5     |       | 57.1 |       | 58.3       |      |
| <b>Having a child</b>               |     |      |                         | 0.94  |          | 0.74  |      | 0.64  |            | 0.17 |
| Yes                                 | 107 | 53.2 | 57.9                    |       | 55.1     |       | 54.2 |       | 47.7       |      |
| No                                  | 94  | 46.8 | 58.5                    |       | 57.4     |       | 57.4 |       | 57.4       |      |
| <b>Training on COVID-19</b>         |     |      |                         | 0.04  |          | 0.04  |      | 0.63  |            | 0.41 |
| Yes                                 | 171 | 83.8 | 61.4                    |       | 59.1     |       | 56.9 |       | 53.2       |      |
| No                                  | 33  | 16.2 | 42.4                    |       | 39.5     |       | 51.5 |       | 45.5       |      |
| <b>COVID-19 information</b>         |     |      |                         | 0.01  |          | <0.01 |      | <0.01 |            | 0.02 |
| From official sources               | 85  | 42.9 | 48.2                    |       | 41.2     |       | 40   |       | 43.5       |      |
| From social media                   | 113 | 57.1 | 67.3                    |       | 69       |       | 69   |       | 60.2       |      |
| <b>COVID-19 infection</b>           |     |      |                         | 0.02  |          | 0.01  |      | 0.04  |            | 0.59 |
| Yes                                 | 95  | 46.6 | 66.3                    |       | 62.1     |       | 58.9 |       | 50.5       |      |
| No                                  | 46  | 22.5 | 41.3                    |       | 26.2     |       | 39.1 |       | 47.8       |      |
| Unknown                             | 63  | 30.9 | 58.7                    |       | 60.3     |       | 61.9 |       | 57.1       |      |
| <b>COVID-19 Vaccination</b>         |     |      |                         | 0.38  |          | 0.29  |      | 0.32  |            | 0.27 |
| Yes                                 | 180 | 88.2 | 59.4                    |       | 57.2     |       | 56.7 |       | 50.6       |      |
| No                                  | 24  | 11.8 | 50                      |       | 45.8     |       | 45.8 |       | 62.5       |      |
| <b>Vaccination doses</b>            |     |      |                         | 0.08  |          | 0.54  |      | 0.59  |            | 0.21 |
| 0                                   | 24  | 11.8 | 50                      |       | 45.8     |       | 45.8 |       | 62.5       |      |
| 1                                   | 56  | 27.5 | 48.2                    |       | 55.3     |       | 55.4 |       | 42.9       |      |
| 2 and above                         | 124 | 60.8 | 64.5                    |       | 58.1     |       | 57.3 |       | 54         |      |
| <b>Smoking cigarette</b>            |     |      |                         | 0.22  |          | 0.36  |      | 0.05  |            | 0.05 |

|  |     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|--|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Yes  | 33  | 16.4 | 48.5 |      | 48.5 |      | 39.4 |      | 36.4 |      |
| No   | 168 | 83.6 | 60.1 |      | 57.1 |      | 58.3 |      | 54.8 |      |
| <b>An old /chronic patient in the family</b> |     |      |      | 0.11 |      | 0.40 |      | 0.21 |      | 0.60 |
| Yes  | 103 | 50.8 | 52.5 |      | 52.4 |      | 50.5 |      | 50.5 |      |
| No   | 96  | 48.2 | 63.5 |      | 58.3 |      | 59.4 |      | 54.2 |      |

212 \*Chi square test

213 **Note:** N: Number of participants, IPC: Infection Prevention and Control, PPE:

214 Personal Protective Equipment, HH: Hand Hygiene.

215

216 There was a significant association between the type of HCWs and overall  
 217 compliance with COVID-19 IPC, PPE and HH; nonclinical staff showed significantly  
 218 lower levels of compliance for all three dimensions ( $p < 0.01$  for all). The same pattern  
 219 was observed in the departments where HCWs worked; non-clinical departments  
 220 showed lower compliance ( $p < 0.01$  for all). HCWs not providing direct care to  
 221 COVID-19 patients, not having face-to-face contact, and not being present during the  
 222 AGP performance reported lower compliance ( $p < 0.01$  for all). HCWs not having  
 223 direct contact with the COVID-19 environment reported lower compliance in total  
 224 IPC and PPE use ( $p < 0.01$  for all). There was no significant association with any of the  
 225 working conditions and practices on COVID-19 and compliance with other IPC  
 226 measures except the type of HCW ( $p = 0.01$ ) (Table 2).

227 **Table 2. COVID-19 IPC compliance in HCWs during healthcare provision by**  
 228 **working conditions and practices on COVID-19**

| Independent variables         | n   | %    | COVID-19 IPC compliance |       |          |       |      |       |            |      |
|-------------------------------|-----|------|-------------------------|-------|----------|-------|------|-------|------------|------|
|                               |     |      | Total IPC%              |       | PPE use% |       | HH%  |       | Other IPC% |      |
|                               |     |      | High                    | p*    | High     | p*    | High | p*    | High       | p*   |
| <b>Profession</b>             |     |      |                         |       |          |       |      |       |            |      |
| Doctors and doctor assistants | 65  | 31.9 | 72.3                    | <0.01 | 66.2     | <0.01 | 70.8 | <0.01 | 46.2       | 0.01 |
| Nurses and Paramedical staff  | 104 | 51   | 67.3                    |       | 66.3     |       | 60.2 |       | 61.5       |      |

|  |     |      |      |       |      |       |      |       |      |      |
|--|-----|------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------|------|
| Non-clinical staff   | 35  | 17.2 | 5.7  |       | 5.7  |       | 11.4 |       | 34.3 |      |
| <b>Department</b>  |     |      |      | <0.01 |      | <0.01 |      | <0.01 |      | 0.47 |
| Outpatient   | 41  | 20.1 | 68.3 |       | 65.9 |       | 65.9 |       | 46.9 |      |
| Inpatient  | 54  | 26.5 | 70.4 |       | 64.8 |       | 62.9 |       | 53.7 |      |
| Other clinical departments   | 61  | 29.9 | 70.5 |       | 70.5 |       | 70.5 |       | 59   |      |
| Non-clinical departments   | 48  | 23.5 | 20.8 |       | 18.8 |       | 18.8 |       | 45.8 |      |
| <b>Direct COVID-19 care</b>  |     |      |      | <0.01 |      | <0.01 |      | <0.01 |      | 0.60 |
| Yes  | 109 | 53.4 | 67.9 |       | 66.1 |       | 62.4 |       | 49.5 |      |
| No   | 56  | 27.5 | 37.5 |       | 30.4 |       | 35.7 |       | 51.8 |      |
| Unknown  | 39  | 19.1 | 61.5 |       | 64.1 |       | 64.1 |       | 59   |      |
| <b>Face-to-face contact with COVID-19 patient</b>                      |     |      |      | <0.01 |      | <0.01 |      | <0.01 |      | 0.88 |
| Yes  | 109 | 53.9 | 75.2 |       | 72.5 |       | 68.8 |       | 54.1 |      |
| No   | 63  | 31.2 | 31.7 |       | 28.6 |       | 33.3 |       | 50.8 |      |
| Unknown  | 30  | 14.9 | 53.3 |       | 53.3 |       | 53.3 |       | 50   |      |
| <b>Direct contact with COVID-19 environment</b>                        |     |      |      | <0.01 |      | <0.01 |      | <0.14 |      | 0.50 |
| Yes  | 95  | 47   | 69.5 |       | 70.5 |       | 57.9 |       | 52.6 |      |
| No   | 66  | 32.7 | 41   |       | 33.3 |       | 45.5 |       | 47   |      |
| Unknown  | 41  | 25.3 | 58.5 |       | 56.1 |       | 63.4 |       | 58.5 |      |
| <b>Presence at AGP performance</b>                                     |     |      |      | <0.01 |      | <0.01 |      | <0.01 |      | 0.30 |
| Yes  | 112 | 55.7 | 82.1 |       | 77.7 |       | 78.6 |       | 56.3 |      |
| No   | 76  | 37.8 | 27.6 |       | 26.3 |       | 31.6 |       | 44.7 |      |
| Unknown  | 13  | 6.5  | 30.8 |       | 38.5 |       | 7.7  |       | 53.8 |      |
| <b>Type of AGP procedure</b>   |     |      |      | <0.01 |      | <0.01 |      | <0.01 |      | 0.36 |
| -Not applicable  | 89  | 44.5 | 28.1 |       | 28.1 |       | 28.1 |       | 46.1 |      |
| -Open airway aspiration<br>+Sputum collection                          | 12  | 6    | 83.3 |       | 83.3 |       | 83.3 |       | 50   |      |
| +Tracheotomy<br>-Tracheal intubation<br>+Cardiopulmonary resuscitation | 25  | 12.5 | 84   |       | 80   |       | 80   |       | 60   |      |
| -Nebulizer treatment   | 42  | 21   | 73.8 |       | 69   |       | 69   |       | 50   |      |
| -More than one   | 32  | 16   | 93.8 |       | 84.4 |       | 90.6 |       | 65.6 |      |

229 \*Chi square test

230 **Note:** N: Number of participants, IPC: COVID-19 Infection Prevention and Control,

231 PPE: Personal Protective Equipment, HH: Hand Hygiene, HCW: Healthcare Worker,

232 AGP: Aerosol Generating Procedure.

233

234

235 In the logistic regression model, profession, having training on COVID-19, providing  
236 direct care to COVID-19 patients and presence when performing AGP were  
237 independent factors associated with total IPC compliance in HCWs. Doctors and  
238 doctor assistants and nurses and paramedical staff expressed a higher level of  
239 compliance with overall IPC compared to non-clinical staff (Doctors OR: 12.11, 95%  
240 CI: 2.23 – 65.84, nurses and paramedical staff OR: 21.38, 95% CI: 4.23 – 108.01).  
241 HCWs who received training on COVID-19 exhibited higher COVID-19 compliance  
242 than those who did not (OR: 3.48, 95% CI: 1.06 – 11.35). HCWs who were present  
243 when AGPs were performed exhibited higher compliance compared to those uncertain  
244 about that (OR: 12.45, 95% CI: 12.16 – 71.76) (Table 3).

245 For PPE; profession, the source of COVID-19 material and providing direct care to  
246 COVID-19 patient were independent factors. Compliance with PPE showed  
247 significant differences among HCWs in various roles. Doctors and doctor assistants  
248 (OR: 11.59, 95% CI: 1.94 – 69.01) and nurses and paramedical staff (OR: 17.91, 95%  
249 CI: 3.22 – 99.64) exhibited higher compliance compared to non-clinical staff. HCWs  
250 who accessed COVID-19 information from official sources expressed lower  
251 compliance compared to those who accessed information from social media (OR:  
252 0.38, 95% CI: 0.17 – 0.83) (Table 3).

253 For HH, departments where HCWs worked, source of COVID-19 material and  
254 education level were independent factors. Clinical departments showed higher  
255 compliance compared to non-clinical departments (inpatient OR: 4.97, %95 CI: 1.62 –  
256 15.21, outpatient OR: 4.21, %95 GA: 1.34 – 13.23, other clinical departments OR:  
257 6.2, %95 GA: 2.1 – 18.35). HCW participants who read COVID-19 related material  
258 from Official sources reported lower compliance than those who read from social  
259 media (OR: 0.45, 95% CI: 0.22 – 0.92) (Table 3).

260 For Other IPC compliance, profession was the only predictor. Nurses and paramedical  
 261 staff expressed higher compliance compared to non-clinical staff (OR: 2.59, 95% CI:  
 262 1.13 – 5.93) (Table 3).

263 **Table 3. Independent determinants of COVID-19 IPC compliance in HCWs**  
 264 **during healthcare provision: Results of multivariate logistic regression analysis\***  
 265 **(Backward elimination method)**

| Variables in the model      | COVID-19 IPC compliance |                      |                     |                       |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
|                             | Total IPC OR (95% CI)   | PPE use OR (95% CI)  | HH OR (95% CI)      | Other IPC OR (95% CI) |
| <b>Profession</b>           |                         |                      |                     |                       |
| Doctors & doctor assistants | 12.11 (2.23 – 65.84)    | 11.59 (1.94 – 69.01) | -                   | 1.35 (0.56 – 3.24)    |
| Nurses & paramedical staff  | 21.38 (4.23 – 108.01)   | 17.91 (3.22 – 99.64) | -                   | 2.59 (1.13 – 5.93)    |
| Non-clinical staff          | Ref.                    | Ref.                 | -                   | Ref.                  |
| <b>Department</b>           |                         |                      |                     |                       |
| Inpatient                   | -                       | -                    | 4.97 (1.62 – 15.21) | -                     |
| Other clinical departments  | -                       | -                    | 6.2 (2.1 – 18.35)   | -                     |
| Outpatient                  | -                       | -                    | 4.21 (1.34 – 13.23) | -                     |
| Non-clinical departments    | -                       | -                    | Ref.                | -                     |
| <b>COVID-19 material</b>    |                         |                      |                     |                       |
| From official sources       | -                       | 0.38 (0.17 – 0.83)   | 0.45 (0.22 – 0.92)  | -                     |
| From social media           | -                       | Ref.                 | Ref.                | -                     |

|   |                      |                     |                     |   |
|---|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| <b>Direct COVID-19 care</b>                       |                      |                     |                     |   |
| Provide   | 0.26 (0.07 – 0.98)   | 1.02 (0.38 – 2.76)  | -                   | - |
| Unknown   | 0.9 (0.2 – 3.99)     | 4.10 (1.12 – 15.03) | -                   | - |
| Does not provide                                  | Ref.                 | Ref.                | -                   | - |
| <b>Face-to-face contact with COVID-19 patient</b> |                      |                     |                     |   |
| Have  | 1.5 (0.27 – 8.07)    | -                   | 1.06 (0.32 – 3.51)  | - |
| Does not have                                     | 0.37 (0.07 – 1.98)   | -                   | 0.4 (0.12 – 1.33)   | - |
| Unknown   | Ref.                 | -                   | Ref.                | - |
| <b>Direct contact with COVID-19 environment</b>   |                      |                     |                     |   |
| Have  | -                    | 2.59 (0.88 – 7.6)   | -                   | - |
| Does not have                                     | -                    | 1.08 (0.36 – 3.23)  | -                   | - |
| Unknown   | -                    | Ref.                | -                   | - |
| <b>Presence at AGP performance</b>                |                      |                     |                     |   |
| Present   | 12.45 (2.16 – 71.76) | 4.36 (0.8 – 23.79)  | -                   | - |
| Not present                                       | 1.59 (0.3 – 8.21)    | 0.7 (0.13 – 3.52)   | -                   | - |
| Unknown   | Ref.                 | Ref.                | -                   | - |
| <b>Training on COVID-19</b>                       |                      |                     |                     |   |
| Received  | 3.48 (1.06 – 11.35)  | 2.66 (0.93 – 7.66)  | -                   | - |
| Did not receive                                   | Ref.                 | Ref.                | -                   | - |
| <b>Education level</b>                            |                      |                     |                     |   |
| Undergraduate and graduate degrees                | -                    | -                   | 8.48 (1.64 – 43.94) | - |

|                            |   |   |                     |   |
|----------------------------|---|---|---------------------|---|
| Associate degree           | - | - | 3.67 (0.56 – 24.04) | - |
| Secondary degree and below | - | - | Ref.                | - |

266 \*Variables included in the logistic regression model

267 For total COVID-19 IPC: age group, education, received training, source of COVID-  
 268 19 information, covid infection, type of HCW, type of department, providing direct  
 269 COVID-19 care, Having face-to-face contact with COVID-19 patients, having direct  
 270 contact with the COVID-19 environment, presence at AGP performance and type of  
 271 AGP.

272 For PPE: education, training, source of COVID-19 information, covid infection, Type  
 273 of HCW, Type of department, providing direct COVID-19 care, having face-to-face  
 274 contact with COVID-19 patients, having direct contact with the COVID-19  
 275 environment, presence at AGP performance and type of AGP.

276 For HH: age group, education, source of COVID-19 information, COVID-19  
 277 infection, type of HCW, type of department, providing direct COVID-19 care, having  
 278 face-to-face contact with COVID-19 patients.

279 For Other COVID-19 IPC: education, source of COVID-19 information, Type of  
 280 HCW.

281 **Note:** IPC: Infection Prevention and Control, OR: Odds Ratio, CI: Confidence  
 282 Interval, PPE: Personal Protective Equipment, HH: Hand Hygiene, AGP: Aerosol  
 283 Generating Procedure.

284

285

286



## 287 **Discussion**

288 This study was designed to assess COVID-19 IPC compliance among HCWs during  
289 healthcare interventions and determine the factors affecting their compliance. The  
290 study showed that 58.3% of HCWs had high compliance with COVID-19 IPC  
291 measures during healthcare interventions. The compliance was over 50% in all  
292 domains (PPE use, HH, and other IPC). Non-clinical staff had lower compliance  
293 compared with clinical staff .

294 There are several studies that reported high compliance with COVID-19 IPC in  
295 HCWs. In Ghana, a study with 424 HCWs in COVID-19 treatment centers reported  
296 high compliance with hand hygiene (88.4%) and PPE usage (90.6%) [16]. Two  
297 Ethiopian studies, involving 403 and 422 participants, found good COVID-19  
298 infection prevention practices in 64.3% and 63.5% of healthcare workers,  
299 respectively. The first study revealed 96.1% compliance with hand hygiene but only  
300 45.2% with PPE usage, possibly due to PPE availability, comfort, negligence, or  
301 education [17, 18].

302 Compared to previous studies, our findings indicated lower IPC compliance rates.  
303 This variance may be attributed to differences in study methods and the timing of data  
304 collection. While our study used compliance scores above the median for each  
305 domain, the referenced studies used either above-average scores or cutoff points of  
306 60% or 75% of total compliance scores. It is also possible that healthcare workers'  
307 adherence to IPC measures decreased over time since the pandemic's onset. A study  
308 on healthcare worker HH practices observed a 13.7% increase upon room exit during  
309 the initial COVID-19 wave. Compliance dropped by 9.9% post-lockdown but  
310 rebounded by 2.8% in the second wave [19].

311 Some studies have reported low HCW compliance with COVID-19 IPC measures.  
312 For instance, in a study involving 422 HCWs at COVID-19 referral hospitals in  
313 Ethiopia, overall compliance with COVID-19 prevention practices was only 22%  
314 [20]. In this study, only 63.4% of participating HCWs received training on COVID-19  
315 and 58.2% read COVID-19 materials and 83.2% of HCWs felt a shortage of  
316 appropriate PPE in the hospital.

317 A review identified various barriers to HCWs' compliance with IPC guidelines for  
318 respiratory infectious diseases, including the availability of training programs, PPE  
319 supply, and individual factors such as knowledge, attitude, beliefs, and PPE  
320 discomfort [21]. Additionally, a study conducted in Uganda, involving 657 HCWs at  
321 community hospitals, found that only 37.0% of participants had good COVID-19 IPC  
322 practices, despite high rates of mask usage and hand washing [22].

323 In our study, doctors, doctor assistants, nurses, and paramedical staff demonstrated  
324 higher COVID-19 IPC compliance than non-clinical staff, except in hand hygiene  
325 (HH) practices. This aligns with prior research. For instance, a study performed in  
326 Private-Not-for-Profit community hospitals in Uganda found a significant association  
327 between clinical HCWs and good COVID-19 IPC practices [22]. Similarly, a study in  
328 COVID-19 treatment centers in Ghana revealed that non-clinical staff exhibited  
329 significantly lower compliance with hand hygiene and PPE usage compared to clinical  
330 staff [16].

331 The difference in compliance may be due to the higher risk faced by clinical  
332 healthcare workers in close contact with COVID-19 patients. A study from Somalia,  
333 reported that ancillary staff, including security workers and cleaners, have a higher  
334 infection risk due to lower knowledge and adherence to infection control measures

335 when handling suspected COVID-19 patients. Healthcare assistants are often  
336 informally employed and receive less attention than formal employees like doctors,  
337 nurses, and technologists [11].

338 Our study showed that HCWs who were present during AGPs exhibited higher  
339 compliance with overall IPC measures compared to those uncertain about that. This  
340 aligns with Ashinyo ME et al.'s study that found high compliance with COVID-19  
341 IPC protocols during AGPs [16]. Healthcare workers performing AGPs face a higher  
342 risk of COVID-19 infection, possibly explaining their heightened compliance [23].

343 Our study also showed that HCWs who had received training on COVID-19 exhibited  
344 higher COVID-19 compliance with overall IPC than those who did not. This is in line  
345 with 2 studies on 422 HCWs in Ethiopia; Etafa W. et al [20] and Arsemahagn MA  
346 (24), and a review study by Cooper S. et al. [25].

347 Interestingly, our study observed that HCWs who obtained COVID-19 information  
348 from official sources showed lower compliance with PPE and HH compared to those  
349 who accessed information from social media. In contrast, a study on the Somali  
350 population reported the opposite, where HCWs who relied on social media for  
351 COVID-19 information exhibited lower compliance, likely due to misinformation  
352 [26]. However, De Martino HCWs may follow specific social media pages they trust  
353 for COVID-19 information.

354 To improve compliance, HCWs must receive continuous awareness and training in  
355 COVID-19 IPC guidelines. Policymakers should develop comprehensive programs to  
356 raise awareness among HCWs at all levels and provide the necessary equipment and  
357 supplies for effective IPC practices in healthcare settings.

358 The study has limitations. Firstly, there could be recall bias; because participants were  
359 asked about their compliance with COVID-19 IPC measures during the late stages of  
360 the pandemic when no COVID-19 patients were likely admitted, and some PPE like  
361 respirators, gowns, and face shields might not have been used. To minimize this bias,  
362 we asked about daily IPC practices and included specific questions for suspected or  
363 confirmed COVID-19 patients. Since the study was a single-centre study, De Martino  
364 Public Hospital may not fully represent other pandemic hospitals in Somalia, although  
365 it plays a significant role in treating COVID-19 patients. Nonetheless, the inclusion of  
366 all staff members and high response rate enhances the generalizability of the results  
367 within the hospital. Furthermore, the limited number of participants has resulted in a  
368 wide confidence interval for the odds ratio derived from the model.

369

## 370 **Conclusions**

371 A notable portion of hospital workers reported inadequate compliance with COVID-  
372 19 IPC measures, with particularly low adherence among non-clinical staff. This  
373 lower compliance might be linked to their perception of low risk and a lack of  
374 awareness regarding to COVID-19. It is essential to recognize that all HCWs in the  
375 hospital are susceptible to COVID-19 infection. Therefore, prioritizing awareness  
376 campaigns and behavior change interventions, especially among non-clinical staff, is  
377 crucial for effective COVID-19 infection prevention and control within the hospital.

378

## 379 **Acknowledgments**

380 First; we give our sincere gratitude to the managers of De Martino hospital for  
381 allowing us to conduct our study on the hospital.

382 Second; we thank Dr. Lul Ahmed Abdi, Maternity department, De Martino hospital  
383 who was the link person between us and the hospital administration. Also she  
384 supported us in the delivering of the questionnaire papers to the hospital workers and  
385 collecting it after collection during the data collection process, since she works at the  
386 hospital and knows the hospital well.

387 Third; we extend our gratitude to the different groups of the healthcare workers at De  
388 Martino hospital for participating in the study.

389

## 390 **References**

391 1- World Health Organization. WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard. Updated  
392 May 3, 2023 [Cited 2023, May 5]. Available from: <https://covid19.who.int/>

393 2- Yang, Y., Peng, F., Wang, R., Guan, K., Jiang, T., Xu, G. et al. The deadly  
394 coronaviruses: The 2003 SARS pandemic and the 2020 novel coronavirus epidemic in  
395 China. *Journal of Autoimmunity*, 2020;111:2-3. Available from:  
396 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaut.2020.102434>

397 3- Lombardi, A., Bozzi, G., Mangioni, D., Muscatello, A., Peri, AM., Taramasso, L.  
398 et al. Duration of quarantine in hospitalized patients with severe acute respiratory  
399 syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection: a question needing an answer.  
400 *Journal of Hospital Infection*, 2020; 105: 404. Available from:  
401 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2020.03.003>

- 402 4- Han Q, Lin Q, Jin S, You, L. Coronavirus 2019-nCoV: A brief perspective from  
403 the front line. *journal of infection*, 2020; 80 (4): 374. Available from:  
404 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2020.02.010>
- 405 5- Wang J, Zhou M, Liu F. Exploring the reasons for healthcare workers infected with  
406 novel coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in China. *Journal of Hospital Infection*,  
407 2020; 105(1):100-101. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2020.03.002>
- 408 6- Li Y, Campbell H, Kulkarni D, Harpur A, Nundy M, Wang X, & Nair H. The  
409 temporal association of introducing and lifting non-pharmaceutical interventions with  
410 the time-varying reproduction number (R) of SARS-CoV-2: a modeling study across  
411 131 countries. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 2021;21(2):193–200. Available from:  
412 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30785-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30785-4)
- 413 7- Goyal R, Gautam RK, Chopra H, Dubey AK, Singla RK, Rayan RA, & Kamal M..  
414 Comparative highlights on MERS-COV, SARS-COV-1, SARS-COV-2 and NEO-  
415 COV. *EXCLI Journal* 2022;21:1260. Available from:  
416 <https://dx.doi.org/10.17179/excli2022-5355>
- 417 8- Andrews, N., Stowe, J., Kirsebom, F., Toffa, S., Rickeard, T., Gallagher, E. et al.  
418 Covid-19 Vaccine Effectiveness against the Omicron (B.1.1.529) Variant. *The New*  
419 *England Journal of Medicine*, 2022;386(16):1532-1541. DOI:  
420 10.1056/NEJMoa2119451
- 421 9- Sohrabi, C., Alsafi, Z., O’neill, N., Khan, M., Kerwan, A., Al-jabir, A. et al.  
422 Review World Health Organization declares global emergency: A review of the 2019  
423 novel coronavirus (COVID-19). *International Journal of Surgery*, 2020;76:71.  
424 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijssu.2020.02.034>

- 425 10- United Nations. WHO chief declares end to COVID-19 as a global health  
426 emergency. Published May 5, 2023 [Cited 2023, May 7]. Available from:  
427 [https://news.un.org/en/story/2023/05/1136367#:~:text=%E2%80%9CLast%20week%  
428 \[2C%20COVID%2D19,the%20agency's%20headquarters%20in%20Geneva.\]\(https://news.un.org/en/story/2023/05/1136367#:~:text=%E2%80%9CLast%20week%2C%20COVID%2D19,the%20agency's%20headquarters%20in%20Geneva.\)](https://news.un.org/en/story/2023/05/1136367#:~:text=%E2%80%9CLast%20week%2C%20COVID%2D19,the%20agency's%20headquarters%20in%20Geneva.)
- 429 11- Abdi, A., Ahmed, AY., Abdulmunima, M., Karanjaa, MJ., Solomona, A.,  
430 Muhammad, F. et al. Preliminary findings of COVID-19 infection in health workers  
431 in Somalia: A reason for concern. International Journal of Infectious Diseases,  
432 2021;104:735–736. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2021.01.066>
- 433 12- Deressa W, Worku A, Abebe W, Gizaw M, Amogne W. Risk perceptions and  
434 preventive practices of COVID-19 among healthcare professionals in public hospitals  
435 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. PLOS ONE, 2021;16(6):11-12. Available from:  
436 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0242471>
- 437 13- Warsame A. Somalia's Healthcare System: A Baseline Study & Human  
438 Capital Development Strategy, Mogadishu: Heritage Institute for Policy Studies and  
439 City University of Mogadishu, 2020. Pp. 39-41.
- 440 14- WHO Regional Office for the Eastern Mediterranean. Somalia health profile  
441 2015, Egypt: 2017. Pp.23.
- 442 15- World Health Organization. Risk assessment and management of exposure of  
443 health care workers in the context of COVID-19: Interim Guidance March 19, 2020.  
444 Pp.1-6.
- 445 16- Ashinyo, ME., Dubik, SD., Duti, V., Amegah, KE., Ashinyo, A., Asare, BA., et  
446 al. Infection prevention and control compliance among exposed healthcare workers in

- 447 COVID-19 treatment centres in Ghana: A descriptive cross-sectional study. PLOS  
448 ONE, 2021;16(3):16. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248282>
- 449 17- Gebremeskel TG, Kiros K, Gesesew HA, Ward PR. Assessment of Knowledge  
450 and Practices Toward COVID-19 Prevention Among Healthcare Workers in Tigray,  
451 North Ethiopia. Frontiers of Public Health, 2021;9:1-8. doi:  
452 10.3389/fpubh.2021.614321
- 453 18- Jemal B, Aweke Z, Mola S, Hailu S, Abiy S, Dendir G. Knowledge, attitude, and  
454 practice of healthcare workers toward COVID-19 and its prevention in Ethiopia: A  
455 multicenter study. SAGE Open Medicine, 2021;9:4. Available from:  
456 <https://doi.org/10.1177/20503121211034389>
- 457 19- Huang F, Armando M, Dufau S, Florea O, Brouqui P, Boudjema S. COVID-19  
458 outbreak and healthcare worker behavioural change toward hand hygiene practices.  
459 Journal of Hospital Infection, 2021;111:27-31. Available from:  
460 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2021.03.004>
- 461 20- Etafa W, Gadisal G, Jabessa S, Takele T. Healthcare workers' compliance and its  
462 potential determinants to prevent COVID-19 in public hospitals in Western Ethiopia.  
463 BMC Infectious Diseases, 2021;21(1):1-7. Available from:  
464 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-021-06149-w>
- 465 21- Houghton, C., Meskell, P., Delaney, H., Smalle, M., Glenton, C., Booth, A. et al.  
466 Barriers and facilitators to healthcare workers' adherence with infection prevention  
467 and control (IPC) guidelines for respiratory infectious diseases: a rapid qualitative  
468 evidence synthesis. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2020;4(4):8-15. DOI:  
469 10.1002/14651858.CD013582.



470 22- Kamacooko, O., Kitonsa, J., Bahemuka, UM., Kibengo, FM., Wajja, A., Basajja,  
471 V. et al. Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices Regarding COVID-19 among  
472 Healthcare Workers in Uganda: A Cross-Sectional Survey. International Journal of  
473 Environtal Research and Public Health, 2021;18(13):1-10. Available from:  
474 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18137004>.

475 23- Harrison D, Muradalia K, El Sahlyb H, Bozkurtc B, Jneid H. Impact of the SARS-  
476 CoV-2 pandemic on health-care workers. Hospital Practice, 2020;48(4):162. DOI:  
477 10.1080/21548331.2020.1771010

478 24- Asemahagn MA. Factors determining the knowledge and prevention practice of  
479 healthcare workers towards COVID-19 in Amhara region, Ethiopia: a cross-sectional  
480 survey. Tropical Medicine and Health, 2020;48:1-9. Available from:  
481 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41182-020-00254-3>

482 25- Cooper S, Wiyeh A, Schmidt B, Wiysonge CS. Cochrane corner: factors that  
483 influence compliance by healthcare workers with infection prevention and control  
484 guidelines for COVID-19 and other respiratory infections. Pan African Medical  
485 Journal,2020;35(2):2. DOI: 10.11604/pamj.suppl.2020.35.2.23012

486 26- Ahmed, M., Fodjo, J., Gele, A., Farah, A., Osman, S., Guled, I. et al. COVID-19  
487 in Somalia: Adherence to Preventive Measures and Evolution of the Disease Burden.  
488 Pathogens, 2020;9(9):10. doi:10.3390/pathogens9090735

489


490

491 **Supporting information**

492 **S1 File: Questionnaire for compliance of healthcare workers with COVID-19**  
493 **prevention and control measures**

494 **S1 Table. Sociodemographic characteristics, related factors to infection**  
495 **prevention and control, working conditions and practices on COVID-19 of the**  
496 **healthcare workers**

497 **S2 Table. Healthcare workers' COVID-19 infection prevention and control**  
498 **measure dimensions (Personal protective equipment use, Hand Hygiene and**  
499 **other infection prevention and control measures)**



Figure